Dear Dick,

Having finished the McDonald fakery and taken considerable time over two full days and parts of nights to do other work part of which I informed you about, I have many impressions and concerns some of which you may or may not want to go no farthur than you. This is a matter into which I would not think of intruding. It also is one on which I believe I owe the responsibility of candor.

Because I have a great amount of work to do on this yet and have had to let everything else go, I'll ask my wife to try to find time to read and correct. I do not have to be in court tomorrow. My pressures seem to have worked and the hearing has been postponed. However, I am going there nonetheless to pick up about 200 pages of xeroxing I should go over as carefully as possible before I speak to you and/or others.

I am not exaggerating the potential importance I attribute to this, emphasis on "potential." I declined to be interviewed by a CBS producer in Washington tomorrow and in New York on Tuesday simply to keep myself free and because I'll be returning from Washington as fast as possible to get onto those xeroxed pages.

(I laughed when I told him, "You have until November -maybe." He agreed by repeating the "maybe.")

My strongest single impression is a question: how could this junk get past any decent professional reading? I can amplify this indefinitely. Instead I pose the question that occurred to me: someone may have had a notion that Grove could be on the market for an assassination book, one that would for most publishers require a special formula and all lust for the impossible, the "solution." If it was known that Grove had expressed such an interest, then this bears on the willingness to gloss over countless red flags waving violently on the inside as it could on such a self-destruct trash being fed.

Obviously, I'm not going to tell Roaset he has someone whose head needs looking into. I'm not talking about what requires knowledge of the assassination or its investigation. Here common sense and a slight memory for what was just read.

There is no single significant detail in the whole garbage can. Not a street or person name even. Nor of a building. All the things the overlooking of which would get a copy boy fired from a hick newspaper are missing here.

There is no end to the non-sequeturs. It is implausible, illogical and sometimes irrational. The so-called support is self-serving garbage.

Given Grove's professionalism, I find myself asking questions about just this. I'm not going to con you or anyone else for a buck. As you know, I have no commitment and asked none of you for the extra work I've done. (Not that I wouldn't be pleased with a suitable reward for it.)

Now I address the lawyer.

This book is overt fraud. If Rosset prints it it will be very hurtful to him. He will also become a laughing stock. Parenthetically, if this is not a spook black book the distinction is meaningless because it could not more prefectly be one if of that originm. I've dealt with two, killing one and the movie and prospects of another. Both French, at least one probably CIA connected. Maybe both.

Suing costs money but if he asked my advice I'd say sue and sit back and enjoy the depositions and what they can mean and do. If not lead to.

How fraudulent is this? I can't begin to give you a simple answer but I can tell you these characters not only are not familiar with the Warren Report alone - they never even bothered to look at the pictures in it. One picture alone, I think on 99, destroys the whole concoction.

But to give you an idea of the ~~demimssions~~ dimensions, few as these pages are, a competent lawyer who prepared his case could take direct testimony from me on just this for five days, easily. It would not be necessary. I'm trying to give you an idea of how really fraudulent this complete manufacture presented as gospel really is.

The bio Starr provided dates to 1969. This is to say I had a copy of it in 1969. John merely retyped it. Can I but wonder?

When you called me I told you right off McDonald is a fake. When the woman at Grove phoned me I asked if it would be ok if I merely annotated the pages she sent me. She said it would be and this I have done. Extensively in the text/outline, only slightly elsewhere. But if suit is to be considered, note the last page: McDonald is a rich man. If he has no other connections.

The appendixes are utterly worthless so I made only a few notes from them.

Unless this is to go farthur, I see no need for taking the considerable time to write these notes out separately. However, I can dictate them later if it is wanted. I'll probably be going over some with you anyway.

Efforts were made to confirm his baloney that he saw the picture of "Saul" printed as that of Oswald. Negative. I add impossible. Can you believe that with all the newspaper and critical interest something like this would be missed?

What I'm doing now is without taking the time for any special sequence typing odds and ends of notes that occurred to me while I was reading, other than on the pages.

He had a different collaborator, James Warner Bellah, on earlier works not in his bio. For that matter, didn't anyone at Grove note ~~[illegible]~~ that the novels Bocca ghosted for him are not listed in it?

I think in what I wrote you I noted the timing on this, when CIA and JFK are hot, and that in the earlier book he had the "confession" not voluntary but at gunpoint and, ~~not in Spain but~~ recently said in Canada.

No professional assassin would dream of undertaking such a job for a mere $50,000.

There are not that many jobs and this sum would not begin to pay defense costs if the assassin were caught.

(And a "pro" taking as few precautions, even in "Troit's" room? But maybe they both have the same first name, Nala. Like Nala Troit. Fun.)

I can't believe some of this comes from McDonald. Example: real shooter doesn't need regular practise. Or keeping derringer in hand when it is slower shooting it from the palm than from a holster. Aside from other problems with that notion.

This world's greatest expert makes no reference to reading the official report or the appended 26 volumes. An investigation without this basic stuff? Of course he is safer that way because his stuff is factually untenable. Even the shooting.

He never identifies the weapon. The reference to "Mauser" is an obvious ripoff. Actually no pro would use such a weapon. Nor would he use a scope for such a short dustance to target. He'd use a very small calibre very high velocity rifle-cartridge combination, with the flattest trajectory and greatest accuracy plus the asset of a phenomenon known as hydrostatic pressure. The heavier bullets drop fast. Nor would he used "disintegrating bullets". He forgets and accounts how one did not disintegrate.

(A high school kid should have caught that one.)

While on all essentials all details are missing, where he seems to add them they are come-ons, sucker-bait. To the uninformed they may seem to make the whole thing real, generally at their best they are nonsense.

Back to McDonald: his account here of how he got started is false. I have known for about six years that his first interest was for a movie with a producer and a writer, both well known, using them as the investigator. He then went to Dallas and came back with propaganda. Woese, a different story than he now tells. Including on the picture essential to this new variant. He then had in effect the opposite and it was based on a ripoff of what I'd published about a different building than the one he now alleges housed "Saul."

We might want to talk about the coincidence in doctrine and content between this book and O'Toole's. They play both sides of one street with only one beneficiary.

He says he gave NYReview an affidavit. Ask for it and let me read it.

He omits even well-known names, like FBI and Secret Service agents involved.

Where he promises more, as with one deMohrenschildt, it will be unprintable. Libel. He and Fensterwald have been jointly hung up on that from the outset.

His bio does not make his fluency in five languages credible. Or his adventures inside the USSR. Or why he'd be sent on a germ-warfare investigation. Nor does it even claim for him the ability to fly jets, essential as a beginning with U-2s.

Some of the known evidence contradicts him completely-even where there is reason to question that evidence. Example: fragments ballistically (only) connected to the Oswald rifle <u>were</u> found in the Presidential car. If he hit only the street, how come?

While one of the obvious answers is that they were planted, neither it nor any other permits any integrity to McDonald's pretensions or book.

Without doubt fragments of bullet remained in both victims. Yet his story is that "Saul" used bullets that "disintegrated" and left no traces. He has Saul of these same disappearing bullets lamenting and theorizing that his first shot missed because JFK bent over (which he did not). So, this disintegrated bullet transited the neck, making a smaller hole in the front on leaving than in the back on entering (opposite norm).

If John Starr read this stuff, he ought not have missed this and more. And he knows me and my work. But he didn't ask me a single question. Ole Doc Savage ought to have had a few questions. That he did not ask any makes me believe he did not want to. Explanations of this can up to deliberateness.

Even if this work is presented as fiction it has no prospect. It will be laughed off any shelves it gets on. It is that amateurish, too.

But were one to forget the thousands of proofs that it is a manufacture of low quality and to pretend that it is for real, it is totally lacking in substance. It all hangs on McDonald's entirely unsupported word.

As for the so called appended "proofs", the comments on the fragments and on the magical glue that held the disintegrating bullet together are enough to take care of that also unidentified fake. Of this there also is more. I did not believe it necessary to waste time on that guck.

Of course I am also concerned about what on publication would be still another assault on all credibility of responsible writing and writers in the field and on the subject. Asking cui bono here ought be enough.

It can't be Grove!

Not only does this crap not mention other blood that flowed, then and there if from a minor wound to a bystander - there is also what is hidden in those goodies promised for the future and glossed over with scant mention. One of these, if it is consistent with his stuff of six-seven years ago, is that LBJ did it, with a guy who sure as hell will and can sue, setting it up. one George deMohrenschildt. He committed two crimes: knowing Jackie's mother and not being unsympathetic to Oswald - finding him less drab than the other local Russian-speakers.

I also wondered about all those involved and the editor/reader when I swa that Oswald had gone to the Cuban "Council" and the Russian "Council" in Mexico City. In each case there was no external way of knowing if he went to the consulate because with the Russians it and the Embassy were in a single building and with the Cubans inside a single compound. But a "council?" Seems like it was dictated but unread.

I do recommend trying to explore what is up. It will not be impossible if my phone has not been listened to.